

selected positions.

### **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed May 16, 1995, the Examiner review claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13. The Examiner objected to the drawings; rejected claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1, 2, 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(j); and rejected claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Also, claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant and the Examiner had a telephone interview on Friday, August 4, 1995, in which claims were discussed. The Examiner's time in that regard is appreciated.

Applicant has amended claims No(s). 1-4, 6,7, 10 and 13. Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13 remain pending.

Each of the Examiner's objections and rejections is addressed below.

### **OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS**

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to show how the tag storage is "coupled" with the video storage; and because of other uses of the term "coupled" in the claims.

The claims have been amended to address this issue. Reconsideration of the objection to the drawings is requested in view of the amendments.

### **Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as unclear. These claims were discussed during our interview. It was agreed that by eliminating the phrase "coupled to" or "coupled with" in claims 1 and 3, that this issue would be addressed. Such amendments have been made. Therefore, reconsideration of this rejected is requested.

### **Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated

by Naimark, et al.

The claims have been amended as discussed in the Examiners interview to explicitly recite that the assembly of the content video image and the associating of positions in the content video image with addresses of storage locations for video frames are carried out by a computer program routine executed in the data processing resources.

With these amendments, it is clear that Naimark, et al. reference does not anticipate claims 1, 2 and 7-9. Accordingly, reconsideration of rejection of such claims is requested.

**Rejections of claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (e)**

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Morgan. As discussed in the Examiners interview, the claims have been amended to explicitly require that the association of addresses of stored frames video data with respective positions in the content video images be done by a computer program routine executed by the data processing resources. With this amendment, it is clear that the independent claims 3 and 10 are not anticipated by the Morgan reference. Claims 6 and 13 add unique features of the content image to select frames of video addressed to use not shown by Morgan.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3, 6, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over the combination of Morgan with the International Conference on Advanced Robotics reference. These claims depend from claims 3 and 10, respectively, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as their base claims. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It submitted that upon entry of the foregoing amendments, present application will be in form for allowance, in such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Aug. 10, 1995

By: 

Mark A. Haynes  
Registration No. 30, 846

HAYNES & DAVIS  
2180 Sand Hill Road, Suite 310  
Menlo Park, California 94025-6935  
Telephone : (415) 233-0188